

Dear "oger",

2/20/89

You call lingered on my mind last night and it is still there this early morning.

To a degree I understand how you feel. I say to a degree because my trust and friendship has been imposed upon by many, I was not as close to any as you were to Sylvia so I cannot have felt it as strongly.

I doubt you will ever know what caused her to do as she did and unless her mind was affected I see no real excuse for it. Moreover, as I told you, I had virtually no contact with her in years. I wrote her several times without response and then wrote her no more. So I know nothing about any changes in her for about two decades, a long time.

As so many of us are, she was too quick to jump to conclusions, and I say this on the chance she was pressured by her nieces. (By the way, if I forget, and I do forget, to send you copies of the few FBI records on her I have, please remind me.) I am sure she really believed the obvious dishonesty and fabrication of the Schiller Scavenging and did not believe my truthful explanation when I learned, from her or from another, that she resented what they quoted me as saying. What they quoted, out of context, did not and as she should have known, could not have referred to her. It was about "opkin, when I referred to cribbing. Her book was not out, she knew I'd not seen a copy of the ms., so she knew I could not have been talking about her, as indeed I was not. She never had the grace to tell me she understood. Sure, I didn't forget it, but it did not influence me in any way and did nothing to diminish the high regard I had for her. It told me only that she was human and frail as are all humans. Later, in fact, I asked her to edit the rough draft of Part II of Post Mortem. She returned it describing it as a tour de force and declined. I told you, I believe, that she knowingly misdated the books she said she listed in terms of their appearance to push the stinker Epstein she, alas, also regarded as almost a son. I knew because she showed me the page proofs when I visited her and had lunch with her at the UN. I made a slight reference to that error and she ignored it and published what she knew was an error. This was long after she knew that in addition to all else Epstein was yellow. I was with her when she literally begged him to appear on a talk show and he refused. (I think it was Channel 5's "Inototy Report. If he had not always been yellow all of the history of the subject, certainly of my books, would have been different because he was afraid to be on Channel 5's Alan Burke Show. They asked me to replace him, it was booby-trapped and I was successful with a bit of intellectual judo and we got the first real and exciting attention up there as a result. But again, she was in this only human, as we all are.

How time flies! I've read two papers, written the enclosed letter to the Dallas people and it is near 7 a.m., time for me to get cracking. I'll return to this later. But I do want you to know that I think you are letting this throw you into a funk and that it should not. Besides, do you want to be a young fogey? . . .

You have no way of knowing too many things and that lack of knowledge ought not prejudice your memory or long friendship. For example, when she was calling for you those days the nurses could not get your phone number from the nieces, could they have had a motive for their indecent refusal? Could Sylvia, realizing that she was quite ill, have wanted to discuss these things with you? I do not believe that either conjecture is unreasonable and that the latter is pretty likely.

Most of us tend to personalize disappointments too much, and perhaps you now are.

I hope you can try to put this out of your mind and to remember her as you knew her for all of your friendship with her, which was ~~much~~ all the time you knew her. If it was a failing on her part, then it was and we all have failings. If it was not but was something she did under influence, like ~~much~~ being told her nieces would have nothing to do with you for whatever reason, just forget that, too. If you do not you will be letting this dominate you and nothing should, however serious it may seem to be....

I've skimmed the few records on her I noted in going over those I got under FOIA.

They indicate that the New York office has a file on her (and if you make a request duplicate it there) and that there are other FBIHQ records. If I can I'll check the Dallas index and find what it has and where those records were not given to me from the Dallas files - have a cross-reference to HQ files and can locate them. I may wait until someone is here and can make this search with no problems because it may tax me. I'll let you know. The reference to 138 is to a file on the security of employees of international organizations. There is another file cited illegibly. I'll see if I can make that one legible by overexposure. Sometimes this has been possible. You might also duplicate to Dallas because they may have a file not one of the main assassination files in which they have such stuff squirreled away and in each request, which can be identical, I would specify that you intend all files, however, classified and whatever their form (which can include tapes), that your request is not limited to the main assassination files. It may make no difference but maybe it will.

The author of the HQ records is Kenneth M. Raupach. He then was a supervisor under Alex Rosen in the General Investigative Division and was one of those more intensely involved in these matters. I don't recall Shroder's function then but because there is no other person identifiable as with Sullivan's Domain is Intelligence Division I'd guess that is where he was. DeLoach was No. 3 then and headed "Crime Records," which actually handled such chores as lobbying, propaganda and leaking. Wick was a supervisor under him and I have a fairy-tale story about how he arranged for the City Editor of the WxStar to shill for them and sign a letter of request Wick had prepared for his signature and they used on disclosing a Hoover statement toward the end of 1966. Malley was an inspector. He was sent to Dallas to take charge at the time of the assassination.

The HQ 105 file is now Foreign Counterintelligence. Formerly it was Internal Security - Nationalistic Tendencies. This number is likely a Guardian file. Oops! It is a 100 file. That means Subversive Matter (Individuals); Internal Security (Organizations); Domestic Security - Investigations.

If I were to hazard a guess I think that what else they have in NY is additional stuff like that indicated and perhaps a little more personal stuff but if it had been something they regarded as significant it would have been indicated by NY which did make on investigation. This belief is supported by the fact that they close that investigation and was not told to reopen it by FBIHQ. HOWEVER, this was before Accessories was published and they certainly had more then.

There are other records and I've gotten them upstairs. It was a bit muck but OK.

...They are in volumes I'd not read so I'm going over them. So far what there is on Sylvia is innocuous.

You'll get Oxford's first article. I'm getting them from Lesar. Oxford was in touch with me quite some time ago and I'd forgotten all about it, except that I think he was to have sent me what he published.

I've gone over all the Sylvia records. I do not copy what is in bound volumes because the only place I can keep my leg elevated at the copies is the only place we have to keep those volumes. Lil has begun the copying and I won't touch what she has done until she has finished, later today or tomorrow. Nothing much there and I'm not including one, Dallas 89-43- 9408, disclosed as 62-109060-7110. There is casual mention of her name only in something printed in Germany.